(3)
CAPOOK.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR (CG)

WRIT PETITION NO.3257 OF 2003

BETWEEN

Manesh Kumar Ramtake S/o Late Shri Tej Lal Ramtake, aged about 28 years, resident of Indra Ward No.3, Kedar Badi Dongargarh district Rajnandgaon (CG).

PETITIONER

P.R. No. 3107/03
Presented by Shri Anam Keshwani
dated 06.10.03

AND

1. The State of Chhattisgarh, Through the Secretary Department of Agriculture, Mantralay, D.K.S.Building,Raipur Tehsil and District Raipur (CG).

2. The Director, Krishi Department ,Chhattisgarh, Raipur, Tehsil and District Raipur.

3. The Deputy Director, Agriculture, Rajnandgaon, District Rajnandgaon (CG).

4. The Collector, Rajnandgaon (CG).

RESPONDENTS

RECEIVED COPY.
To A.G. BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLES 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

(34)

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक WPNo. 3257 /2003 सन् 200

विरुद्ध

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

21.11.2003

Petitioner by Shri Awadh Tripathi, Advocate.

Shri Ranbir Singh, Govt. Advocate takes notice on behalf of the Respondents.

The petitioner has preferred this petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India being aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the Respondents No. 1 and 2 for not considering his case for compassionate appointment.

The petitioner's case is that the father of the petitioner namely Tej Lal Ramtake was working as Agriculture Development Officer in Agriculture Office, Dongargarh, District-Rajnandgaon.. During the service he expired on 8.4.2000, copy of the death certificate is Annexure P/1. The petitioner submitted an application for compassionate appointment through proper channel and the same was recommended by the Respondents No. 2 and 3. Vide letter dt. 5.2.2001 the Respondent No.3 directed the petitioner to attend the camp of Collector, Rajnandgaon on 22.2.2001 for consideration of his case. Vide letter dated 22.2.2001 the petitioner was intimated that his application for compassionate appointment has been sent to the appropriate authority. But since then no reply has been received, although the Collector and Deputy Director had intimated the petitioner that his application is under consideration. The petitioner is duly qualified but the respondents are not giving compassionate appointment to him, therefore they may be directed to give compassionate appointment to the petitioner.

(35)

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

W.P. No. 3257/03

मामला क्रमांक ..... सन् 200

..... विरुद्ध .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that even though the petitioner is fully eligible for compassionate appointment as per the Rules and Guidelines issued in this connection by the State Govt. from time to time, accordingly he applied and the Respondents No. 2 and 3 recommended the case of the petitioner even then he has not been considered for compassionate appointment. Therefore, the petitioner may be allowed to make a detailed representation and the respondents may be directed to consider and decide the same, for which learned Govt. Advocate has no objection.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case the petitioner is allowed to make a detailed representation within a period of 10 days from today to the Respondent No.2 who in turn will decide the representation within a period of 2 months from the date of receipt of the representation in an objective manner considering all the contents of the representation by passing a reasoned order and intimate the petitioner about the decision taken by the respondents.

With the above observations this petition is disposed of finally.

Parties are entitled for certified copy of this order.

Sd/-
L.C.BHADOO
Judge

[पीछे देखिये